

## World Migrants as a Collective before the Response of Space Designers

**Rolando Gonzalez-Torres\***

*Department of Architectural Engineering, Southern Illinois University, Illinois, USA*

**\*Corresponding Author:** Rolando Gonzalez-Torres, Department of Architectural Engineering, Southern Illinois University, Illinois, USA.

**Received:** March 22, 2024; **Published:** April 09, 2024

### Abstract

Exclusion based on stigma is distinguishable from other forms of marginalization because it depends on social consensus about the targets that tends to be shared among a set of people, and is often accompanied by a social justification or supportive ideology for moral segregation. Today more than ever, it is clear through the immense migratory movements, which the provision of a safe and stable place to live cannot be taken for granted. The current world does not offer the conditions of minimum habitability for millions of people. So, what happens when man and habitat do not coincide due to migrating movements? Most of the immigrating parties are uprooted human beings in search of land, looking for a corner in the planet to live, where everyone is entitled to basic rights and freedom. Immigration right is not an issue of ideology, historical debts or revenge, nor donations or contracts; it is a matter of commitment to the Fundamental Rights of Man to ensure a better global future. Considering immigrants world citizens and faced by this type of circumstances we should wonder, what kind of response do these human beings deserve from the self-named Space Designers? What is the true commitment of Urbanists and Architects, if any, within society? Do they have to take positions like that doctor who, forgetting his economic status, turns altruistically to the resolution of others' pain? Does Culture establish binding commitments to those who are professionally prepared to exercise a job? Should it?

**Keywords:** migration; habitability; housing right; segregation; commitment

There is a very close relationship between individual and society [1], and both are inevitably linked to physical structures being natural, urban or architectural, on any of their combinations. Important studies show that society has become an essential condition for human life to arise and to continue. Their reciprocal relationship is ultimately one of the profound of all the problems of social philosophy. There are authors stating that it is more philosophical rather than sociological because it involves the question of values. It is clear that human beings depend on society since it is in the society that an individual is surrounded and encompassed by culture, as a societal force [2].

Man is not finished, as Gehlen says, but remains as a task for himself and from himself. It is the fellow that takes positions, that forms an opinion, gives his judgement, takes sides, and intervenes in things. Culture is the "nature" that man has created for himself, is the only one in which he can live [3]. For countless generations, man has built his scenarios and the conditions in which he has to advance and grow, and yet a habitat's occupation is not for the consideration of those who voluntarily wish to do so. Today more than ever, it is clear through the immense migratory movements that the provision of a safe and stable place to live cannot be taken for granted. The current world does not offer the conditions of minimum habitability for millions of people. So, what happens when man and habitat do not coincide?

Migration is one of the oldest phenomenon in human history, yet in many cases today is perceived as a threat or attack to current borders and political maps. It is a very old human condition and it is generated for many reasons. Migration movements have accompanied most civilizations throughout history. Nowadays, with planet's political configuration and its global interconnection, migration is a determining factor in such delicate factors as demography, economy and, ultimately, population's welfare state. The proportion of immigrants varies greatly between countries. Thus, while in some it exceeds half of the population, in others it is less than 0.1%. The United States is the country that has in its territory the largest number of people born abroad in the world: 48 million in 2015, according to United Nations data. This figure is almost 5 times higher than that of Saudi Arabia (11 million) and 6 times higher than that of Canada (7.6 million). However, in relation to its size, the proportional number of immigrants in these last two countries is much higher: 34% and 21%, respectively, compared to 15% in the United States. Switzerland, with 29% of immigrants, is ahead of the United States or France, while Luxembourg has an even higher proportion (46%). While the attractiveness of the country influences, so does its size. The smaller it is, the higher will probably be the percentage of the population born abroad. In countries with high internal migration between provinces, as in the case of China, these are not considered as such because they are not international. Conversely, if the European Union were to form a single country, the proportion of immigrants would decrease considerably, since nationals of another State of the Union would no longer be immigrants. The relative importance of the two types of migration - internal and international - is largely related to the division of territory into nations. The immigrants reached a total of 258 million in 2017, according to United Nations data. They actually only represent a small minority of the world population (3.4%), since most of the people live in their countries of birth. The percentage of immigrants has increased very little during the last decades: it was 2.9% 30 years ago (in 1990) and 2.3% 55 years ago (in 1965). It has not changed much in the last hundred years. However, the distribution of immigrants is not the same as a century ago. One of the changes that has taken place since then is the "inversion of migratory flows", between the North and the South, according to Alfred Sauvy, because the countries of the South today produce an important part of the population of international migrants [4]. International migrants today are divided into four groups of more or less equal size:

- Migrants born in the South and living in the North (89 million in 2017, according to United Nations data);
- South-South migrants (97 million), who have migrated from one country in the South to another in the South;
- North-North migrants (57 million).
- The fourth group, that of people who were born in the North and have migrated to the South, which was the predominant one a century ago, is much less numerous (14 million) [5].

On the other hand, the way in which the city unfolds will greatly condition the future of the planet. According to UN-Habitat, by the year 2030, nearly 3,000 million people - or 40% of the world's population - will need access to housing, basic infrastructure and other services such as water supply and sanitation systems. These figures can translate into the need to build 96,150 daily dwellings in soils with services and relevant licenses from this time until 2030 [6]. The organization's commitment is vertical and concentrated growth, the opposite of what happens in informal settlements: Cities that grow horizontally are not sustainable in the long term due to negative externalities, such as congestion, infrastructure problems, pollution and social disaggregation, and in them it is increasingly difficult to manage the constant increase of the urban population. This type of settlement favors the pressure on natural resources and puts the sticks in the wheels to the development of efficient mobility. UN-Habitat promotes the rehabilitation of areas, the design of new areas with higher densities, the reconstruction of land that was previously used for industrial purposes, the conversion of buildings and the development oriented to maximize the use of transport. A well-designed public space not only contributes to improving the overall appearance, but also revitalizes economic activities and favors the functionality of a city. Neighborhoods with high densities, with public spaces, infrastructure and adequate transport services motivate walking, cycling and other forms of non-motorized mobility and respect for the environment. As Carlos Moreno insisted, "Accommodation must be an element of social inclusion within the city, entailing in itself a series of measures that ensure neighbors a social presence in the urban environment." Talking about urban sustainable development implies first of all being aware of the intrinsic socio-territorial fragility of cities, for this reason he emphasizes the importance of the notion of resilience, which is indisputably one of five challenges of the city of tomorrow, as also are the environmental, social, economic and cultural challenges. Five challenges that we can face with the help of the three powerful levers that represent social innovation, the reinvention of urban infrastructures and the technological revolution, particularly digital.

Under regular conditions, man perceives himself as an agent of change in his physical environment, as well as the transformations that arise in him from his own activity because, by acting in the external world and transforming it, man simultaneously changes or transforms his own nature [7]. Particularly, with the creation of his habitat the human being assumes forever the role of security and development provider, through the creation of his lair and its operations center respectively. The impulse that gives settlement to the development of civilizations, widely studied by anthropologists, is crucial in the evolutionary history of man. When the territory stops being that immense space, no-man's land, to give place to my territory, where I organize my activities and ideas, where I put my belongings, where I assert my leadership, where I return every time I leave, that is when development can be given in the whole sense of the word. Housing becomes not only a safe place to take refuge, but an incipient base of operations from which to start in the search for a better life. According to Albert Camus, it is preferable to have a territory, even if it is adverse, hostile and unassimilable, that not having any and feeling deprived of a place of your own. He expresses: "a world that can be explained even with bad reasons, is a familiar world. But, on the other hand, in a universe stripped of lights and illusions, man feels like a foreigner, a stranger. His exile has no remedy because he is deprived of the memory of a lost home, or of hope in the Promised Land" [8]. The sense of territoriality is innate in man because it comes from his evolution in phylogeny and its manifestations throughout ontogeny, that is, from the experiential information that as a species has accumulated for millennia. As one more family within the animal kingdom, his instinctive conscience impels him to acquire a space of his own as an individual and, even stronger, a collective space for his closest and most significant group where to guarantee collective security and its procreative continuity.

For all these reasons, inclusive immigration, where adequate integration of immigrants facilitates their social participation and incorporation into the economic fabric, resolves many of the problems that tend to arise when there is rejection. Exclusion based on stigma is distinguishable from other forms of marginalization because it depends on social consensus about the targets that tends to be shared among a set of people, and is often accompanied by a social justification or supportive ideology for moral segregation. Group memberships are very important to people and how they respond to the threat of exclusion from their groups [9]. The deficiency to adapt to local traditions, language difficulties and/or the lack of inclusion in the labor market has pushed immigrants into seclusion and led them to rooming houses or overcrowded urban slums. In addition, for the average citizen as well as for some immigrants, the presence of the struggling immigrant in the western city is annoying and hardly being tolerated by both parties. The old dichotomies of migration study -internal versus international, forced versus voluntary, temporary versus permanent, legal versus illegal- blur as both the motivations and modalities of migration become much more diverse [10]. Most of the immigrating parties are uprooted human beings in search of land, looking for a corner in the planet to live, where everyone is entitled to basic rights and freedoms. Immigration right is not an issue of ideology, historical debts or revenge, nor donations or contracts; it is a matter of commitment to the Fundamental Rights of Man to ensure a better global future. We are used to understand immigration as bad news for a city, something that will make it uglier, a cacotopia. City planners Lewis Mumford and Jane Jacobs -or even before, the sociologist and botanist Patrick Geddes— spoke of cacotopia (the bad place) versus eutopia (the good place) referring to cities. For sure there might be creative ways to generate eutopia including immigrants.

The Article 25 of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 [11] reads as follows: Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services. At the beginning of 2018, The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) was organized with the intention of addressing one of the currently most important issues in the world. One of the pillars of this pact is the obligation to respect and protect the human rights of all migrants. It was finally held in Marrakech, Morocco, on December 10 and 11, 2018. The conference was convened under the auspices of the General Assembly of the United Nations and was carried out in accordance with resolution 71/1 of 19th September 2016, entitled "Declaration of New York for Refugees and Migrants", which decided to initiate a process of intergovernmental negotiations leading to the adoption of the Global Compact on Migration. The pact is the first global framework for global governance and international cooperation on migration; agreeing it is a test for multilateralism and for the United Nations capacity to respond to global issues, "this pact will show that we are stronger together than separated" - Miroslav Lajcak (president of the United Nations' General Assembly). The pact was adopted by consensus (all except the United States), and Hungary,

unlike the United States did not depart from the negotiations, but still did not sign it because it considers migration as something “negative and with serious consequences for national security.”

In any case, immigrants are human beings with human needs as everyone in the world. There is no way out by ignoring that reality nor by establishing simple border-closing solutions. Migration movements have proven that culture is in constant evolution and that citizenship is not only what a passport can provide anymore. Cultural citizenship should be viewed in terms of satisfying demands for full inclusion into the social community [12]. In other times, when we were less developed, public space, squares and paths, served to receive foreigners. In what is now the current Spain territory, Jews, Christians and Muslims shared their cities with any kind of itinerants with less antagonism and fear than we do experience these days. We might need a different kind of city for a different world. A world less oriented to merchandize and self-benefit, to possession. Particularly possession of land. Man arrives in life with no belongings, but with the irrefutable right of housing.

Being fair, it is fundamental to think that immigrants, besides all their material problems, normally suffer of evident low esteem, which put them in great disadvantage. In his book *Incognito*, pseudoscientist David Eagleman tells us that researchers have been looking for the gene related to schizophrenia for decades, and that in fact they have found a few. However, no gene predisposes you to suffer this psychosis as much as the color of your passport. According to several studies, “the social tension of being an immigrant in a new country is one of the fundamental factors for suffering schizophrenia.” The less social acceptance, the more possibility of getting sick: “It seems that a repeated social rejection disturbs the normal functioning of the dopamine systems” [13].

Nowadays, those old dichotomies referred to incoming migrants are not valid anymore. Much has to be done yet in terms of politics, education, human rights, philanthropy, brotherhood, fairness, etc. in order to accommodate new rules to provide a livable environment for all those millions of people that are forced to move. Meanwhile, what kind of context can we imagine to house there people? It is not a matter of refuges for temporary occupancy anymore, it is a matter of increasing flexibility in our conventional urban structures to make them able to deal with this kind of phenomenon. For architects and environment designers is a much higher challenge than just proposing refugee camps. Currently we live an *exopolis* [14], an enormity of external elements that interfere in the own logic of the city, among them the globalization, that causes that we have to face global problems with local infrastructures. Louis Kahn referred to that anyone can design a building if he is concerned only with the need of that space. But an architectural space, one considering ethical living values, besides satisfying its physical needs also should satisfy the psychological needs. With this in mind, a solution involving spaces to receive, lodge and facilitate the life of incoming migrants should consider this not a problem of invasion but rather one of integration, and a serious responsibility to be able to embrace them assuring them a minimum of satisfaction and dignity.

What kind of response do these human beings deserve from the self-named Space Designers? What is the true commitment of Urbanists and Architects, if any, within society? Do they have to take positions like that doctor who, forgetting his economic status, turns altruistically to the resolution of others’ pain? Does Culture establish binding commitments to those who are professionally prepared to exercise a job? Should it?

## References

1. Hossain A and Ali K. Relation between Individual and Society (2014).
2. Ibidem.
3. Gehlen A, El hombre, Ed. Sígueme, Salamanca (1987): 35
4. Pison G. “The number and proportion of immigrants in the population: international comparisons”. Population & Societies No. 472. Institut National d’Études Démographiques (INED) (2010).
5. Pison G. Atlas de la Population Mondiale. Ed. Autrement (2019).
6. United Nations. 17 Goals to Transform Our World. The U.N. Sustainable Development Goals (2015).
7. Marx, K., El Capital, ed. Mateu, Barcelona, (1966).
8. Camus A and Wilson E. Sociobiology, the new synthesis.

9. Abrams D, Hogg MA and Marques JM. (Eds.). "The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion". New York: Psychology Press (2005).
10. King R. "Towards a new map of European migration". International Journal of Population Geography 8.2 (2002): 89-106.
11. UDHR. "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights". Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation 39.3 (1968): 37-38.
12. Pakulsky J. Cultural citizenship, Citizenship Studies 1.1 (1997): 73-86.
13. Eagleman D. Incognito. The Secret Lives of the Brain. Vintage Books ed., New York (2011).
14. Soja EW. "Postmetropolis: Critical studies on cities and regions". Dream traffickers. Maps 21 (2008).

**Volume 6 Issue 4 April 2024**

**© All rights are reserved by Rolando Gonzalez-Torres.**